## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

EXCHANGE 12, LLC : CIVIL ACTION

•

v. : NO. 23-3740

:

PALMER TOWNSHIP, et al. :

## ORDER

**AND NOW,** this 25<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2024, it is **ORDERED** that:

- 1. The Defendants' motion to strike [Doc. 18] is **DENIED**.<sup>1</sup>
- 2. The Defendants' motion to dismiss [Doc. 19] is **DENIED** with leave to renew as a motion for summary judgment, pending completion of discovery.
- 3. The Defendants' motion to stay [Doc. 31] is **DENIED**.<sup>2</sup>

BY THE COURT:

<u>/s/ Jeffrey L. Schmehl</u> JEFFREY L. SCHMEHL, J.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Court has previously ruled that the alleged comment referred to in Paragraph 19 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is not protected by the attorney-client privilege. [ECF 55, 67].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Gwynedd Properties, Inc. v. Lower Gwynedd Township, 970 F.2d 1195, 1201-1202 (3d Cir.1992); M & M Stone Co. v. Pennsylvania Dept. of Environmental Protection, No. CIV.A. 07-CV-04784, 2008 WL 4467176 at \* 5 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 29, 2008).